

REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 27, 2004, claims 59-78 were examined and rejected. In the current response, claims 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, 68-70, 72, 73, 74, 76, and 78 are being amended, claims 61, 62, 67, 71, and 77 are being canceled, and claims 79-83 are being added. Accordingly, claims 59, 60, 63-66, 68-70, 72-76, and 78-83 will be pending in this application.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, claims 59-61, 63-64, and 66-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claims 59-61, 63-64, and 66-72 only recite an abstract idea that does not necessarily apply or advance the technological arts.

The Applicants have canceled claims 61, 67, and 71 making rejection of these claims moot. The Applicants have amended claim 59 to address the Examiner's rejection thereof. Amended claim 59 relates to a computer implemented method for ordering and tracking components wherein each of the method steps are performed automatically, without human intervention. Claims 60, 63, 64, 66, 68-70, and 72 are dependent on amended claim 59. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 59-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeWolf et al.* (US 2002/0032626 A1, hereafter *DeWolf*). The Applicants have amended claim 59, and as the rejection may be applied to amended claim 59, respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 59 recites a computer implemented method for ordering and tracking components required to assemble an asset, the method comprising:

creating an asset record for the asset designated for assembly, wherein the asset is comprised of a plurality of components;

creating a purchase order for each of the plurality of components of the asset;

storing the asset record and purchase order information in a management database, wherein the stored purchase order information is associated with the asset record in the management database;

upon receiving the plurality of components along with information regarding the purchase orders of the components, retrieving and updating the asset record in the management database using the received purchase order information to reflect that the plurality of components have been received; and

determining whether all components required for assembling the asset have been received,

wherein each of the method steps are performed automatically, without human intervention.

DeWolf does not teach, disclose, or even suggest each limitation of claim 59. For example, *DeWolf* does not teach, disclose, or even suggest creating an asset record for an asset comprised of a plurality of components, creating a purchase order for each of the components of the asset, storing the asset record and purchase order

information in a management database, retrieving and updating the asset record in the management database (upon receiving the components) to reflect that the components have been received, and determining whether all components required for assembling the asset have been received, wherein each of the method steps are performed automatically, without human intervention.

As disclosed in *DeWolf*, a Global Asset Information Registry (GAIR) system is used to record information related to an asset in an asset registry through the life of the asset. The GAIR system of *DeWolf*, however, is not designed to order and track components needed to assemble an asset in an automated manner. No where in *DeWolf* is it taught, disclosed, or even suggested that the GAIR system automatically creates an asset record for an asset and purchase orders for each of component needed to assemble the asset, stores the asset record and purchase orders in a management database, updates the asset record when the components are received, and determines whether all components required for assembling the asset have been received, as required in amended claim 59. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the precise portion(s) of *DeWolf* that cite the limitations of amended claim 59.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 59 is in allowable form. Claims 60, 63-66, 68-70, and 72 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, on claim 59 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. In addition, amended claim 69 further recites that the assembled asset is deployed into a data center having a plurality of assets each connected to a network, wherein the management database is also connected to the network. No where in *DeWolf* is it taught, disclosed, or even suggested that an asset recorded in the GAIR system is connected to a network that is also connected to a database implementing the GAIR system. Amended claim 72

further recites that the asset record in the management database is updated to include a network address, Local Area Network detail, or a MAC address for the deployed asset. This further limitation is also not taught, disclosed, or even suggested in *DeWolf*. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the precise portion(s) of *DeWolf* that cite the additional limitations of amended claims 69 and 72.

Amended independent claim 73 is a computer readable medium claim containing limitations similar to amended independent claim 59 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. Claims 74-76 and 78 are dependent on claim 73 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 73.

III. New Claims 79-83

New claim 79 is dependent on claim 73 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 73.

New claims 80-83 are dependent on claim 59 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. In addition, claim 80 further recites that the deployed asset comprises a computer and that the asset record in the management database is updated to include software configuration information of the deployed asset. Claim 81 further recites that contact with the deployed asset is maintained through the management database and network. Claim 82 further recites that the deployed asset is serviced, updated, configured, or diagnosed through the management database and network. Claim 83 further recites that the servicing, updating, configuring, or diagnosing is performed automatically, without human intervention. Applicants submit that none of the further limitations of new claims 80-83 are taught, disclosed, or even suggested in *DeWolf*. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the precise portion(s) of *DeWolf* that cite the additional limitations of new claims 80-83.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP



Gregory Suh
Reg. No. 48,187

Dated: September 27, 2004

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104
Fax: (650) 752-0995